DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 165 HE 009 744

AUTHOR Ladd, Everett Carll, Jr.
TITLE The Economic Position of the American Professoriate: A Survey Portrait.
INSTITUTION Connecticut Univ., Stamford.
SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Jan 78
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Academic Planning Conference "Ethical and Economic Issues: Academic Salaries and Supplemental Income" (3rd, Los Angeles, California, January 25-27, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; Conference Reports; Consultants; Departments; Economic Factors; Higher Education; *Income; Intellectual Disciplines; *National Surveys; Professors; *Salary Differentials; Statistical Data; *Teacher Salaries
IDENTIFIERS *Supplemental Income

ABSTRACT

A preliminary report on the economic standing of American academics, based primarily on a national survey of faculty conducted in the spring of 1977, is presented. The economic position of professors is compared to other segments of the population, and income differences within the faculty are also examined. It is shown that since 1970-71, faculty salary increases have fallen behind the increases in salaries of workers in general. The survey showed the medium base salary of academics to be $18,500 in 1976-77, while the medium family income of the general public in 1976 was $14,958. It was found that one quarter of the total faculty surveyed reported that they earned 20 percent over and above their institutional base, while another fourth earned 10 or 19 percent above it. With lower base salaries and fewer chances for supplementary income, the faculty do better than natural scientists, and professors in the professional fields do the best of all. Statistical data are appended, including data on supplementary earnings of faculty. (SPG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED152165

THE ECONOMIC POSITION OF THE AMERICAN PROFESSORIATE: A SURVEY PORTRAIT

by

Everett Carll Ladd, Jr.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Everett Carll Ladd, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 009 744

Presented at the Third Annual Academic Planning Conference
"ETHICAL AND ECONOMIC ISSUES: ACADEMIC SALARIES AND SUPPLEMENTAL INCOME"
January 25, 26, & 27, 1978, Los Angeles, California
University of Southern California Office of Institutional Studies

Support of the Carnegie Corporation of New York is gratefully acknowledged

The Economic Position of the American Professoriate: A Survey Portrait

Everett Carll Ladd, Jr., Professor, Political Science; Director, Social Science Data Center University of Connecticut; Acting Director The Roper Center

This is a preliminary report on the economic standing of American academics, based primarily upon a national survey of faculty conducted under the direction of Seymour Martin Lipset and myself in the Spring of 1977. The word preliminary should be stressed. More elaborate forms of analysis of the data can and will be performed. I trust, however, that this incomplete, largely descriptive assessment will prove of some interest and value to this audience.

One often finds that survey data are poorly suited to certain analytic objectives in a substantive area but at the same time are especially well suited to a related set of objectives. So it is, I think, with regard to the economic position of college professors. At one level, the data from the 1977 Ladd-Lipset survey are less satisfactory than those already available from other sources. Specifically, since 1958 the American Association of University Professors has conducted systematic assessments of faculty compensation. For academic year 1976-77, according to the AAUP report, the average salary of all full-time academics was $17,930.[1] Our faculty survey showed the average salary to be $18,500. Clearly the AAUP information is to be preferred. It is better to use aggregate data based on official university salary records--as the AAUP

---

[1] "No Progress This Year: Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 1976-1977," AAUP Bulletin, (August 1977), p. 152.

does, drawing now on the collection of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)--than to rely on sample survey data where individual professors state, and may misstate, their earnings. Even here, though, it is striking to note how closely our survey estimate corresponds to the AAUP-NCES findings.

In other cases, our survey data are in fact the best available. The opportunity for subgroup analysis which is built into the survey mode of information collection and organization permits us to examine facets of the income distribution within the professoriate that are beyond the reach of the available aggregate data collections. Then, too, Lipset and I asked certain questions bearing on faculty income which are pertinent and for which there simply is no aggregate data source. Total family income, as opposed to institutional salary, is a case in point.[2]

The analytic objectives of this paper

I intend to introduce preliminary information here on two components of the economic status of American academics. First,

---

[2]Martin Lipset and I administered a questionnaire to faculty at 161 colleges and universities in the United States. Questionnaires were first mailed in March 1977, and all data collection had been completed by June 1977. Our approach involved, in the first instance, a sampling of institutions, and in the second a random sampling of faculty within the selected schools. Forty-three hundred and ninety-three faculty completed questionnaires, 55.3 percent of those who received them. All distributions reported in this paper are based upon weighted data. A copy of the technical report describing in detail survey procedures will be available March 1, 1978.

I will treat briefly the economic position of professors compared to other segments of the population. Just as total family income, rather than compensation of individual workers, provides the most revealing assessment of the economic position of the populace generally, so it makes sense to look to family income to see how well, or poorly, members of the academic profession are doing.

A second topic will receive slightly more extended treatment. I will examine income differences within the faculty, using as the measure not family income but professors' personal professional earnings. What are the disparities in total professional compensation of different groups within the academic community? Total personal professional income has been computed on the basis of responses to two separate questions posed in our 1977 survey. Faculty were asked to specify their "basic institutional salary, before taxes and deductions, for the current academic year /1976-1977/," and they were subsequently asked how much they earned over and above this base. By combining responses to the two, a composite earnings figure was arrived at for each respondent in our study. The distinction between faculty on nine-month contracts and those employed on an eleven-month basis is removed, because it is the individual's earnings from all sources that is being identified. Total personal professional income is less well suited than basic institutional salary--if the latter is adjusted to remove the nine-month/eleven-month factor--to an assessment of salary

practices directly attributable to decisions of university administrations. But the former is preferable if one wishes to focus, as I do, on the full professional remuneration of different segments of the American academic community.

The comparative income situation of academic families

In its latest report on the economic status of the profession, the AAUP notes that "wage and salary employees in other industries have done better....Until 1970-71, faculty salaries approximately kept pace with the increases in salaries of workers in general. Since then, they have fallen steadily behind. The average salary of all nonagricultural employees has risen 48 percent since 1970-71; that of faculty members only 70 percent as much."[3] This is a fact, and surely a disturbing one not only for members of the professoriate but for all those concerned with the overall economic health of higher education in the United States.

Still, it is not inappropriate to note that--especially because many faculty realize substantial income beyond their base salary and because the proportion of two-income families has been rising dramatically within the professoriate--the margin between the institutional salaries of faculty and their total incomes is rather wide and has probably been stretching over the past decade. Our survey showed the median base salary of academics to be $18,500 in 1976-77; that year the median family income of professors, by way of contrast, was $25,500.

---

[3]"No Progress This Year," p. 148.

More than a third of all academic families earned over $30,000 in 1976, while 15 percent achieved over $40,000 from all sources. The faculty income structure compares favorably not only with that of the general public--where the 1976 median family income was $14,958--but as well with the income of the more highly compensated professional cohorts. The median family income of academics exceeded that of all families whose heads had finished four years or more of college by $5,000 in 1976, and the faculty median actually increased by a higher proportion from 1974 through 1976 than did that of all college graduates (Tables 1 and 2).[4] The comparisons of the income of professorial families with those in other segments of the professional stratum is imperfect, partly because certain relevant 1976 data have not yet been released by the Census Bureau, and in part because the margin of error inherent in these data collections is sufficient to cast some doubt upon the findings. Still, it appears unlikely that academic families have experienced any relative decline in their overall economic situation in recent years, vis-a-vis the larger professional-managerial stratum.

---

[4] Lipset and I conducted a national faculty survey comparable in design to the 1977 study in the Spring of 1975. Tables 1 and 2 report data from both of these inquiries.

Differences in professional remuneration within the faculty

Many academics realize substantial income beyond their base salaries. About one quarter of the total reported that they earned at least 20 percent over and above their institutional base, while another fourth earned 10 to 19 percent above it. In some disciplines, such as business administration and engineering, the proportions are very much higher.

With lower base salaries and far fewer chances for supplementary income, faculty in the humanities and fine arts continue to bring up the rear in the academic salary march. Social scientists do better than natural scientists, indeed better than anyone else in the old liberal arts and sciences core of the university.

Professors in the professional fields do the best of all. At the head of the pack, to no one's surprise, are medical school faculty. Fifty-six percent of them reported professional income in excess of $35,000 in the past academic year. While we have too few cases to report on it reliably, law school professors appear to take second place, although the engineers rival them closely. Tables 2 and 6 make evident the importance of the "applied versus liberal arts" distinction. In some instances, notably medicine, institutional salaries are higher in the former sector, but most of the variance between these two spheres is accounted for by outside income sources.

Institutional-based salaries are as high for biological and physical scientists as they are for faculty in education and business administration. The primary applied fields are linked up to client groups outside that provide opportunies for consulting, private practice, and research-related support. In a sense, the social sciences are closer to the applied fields than any other group of arts and sciences disciplines. A notably higher proportion of social scientists, for example, report some paid consulting.

Many of the basic differences in professional remuneration follow expected lines. Thus academics at the major research universities surpass their colleagues at lesser institutions in compensation by a substantial margin. Those who do consulting and who receive external research support show higher compensation than their colleagues who do not achieve in these areas. Scholarly productive faculty earn more than their non-productive brethren.

When one attempts to determine what sorts of factors may be related in some causal sense to variations in total professional remuneration among faculty, one encounters a number of sticky analysis problems. For example, the categories of one variable may subsume other distinctions which are really the critical elements. I have not had the opportunity, in preparing this paper, to begin to untangle this complex web of causality, but certain observations can be brought forth in a tentative fashion.

The data base which is available, including the 1969 Carnegie Commission study of 60,000 faculty, the 1975 study which Lipset and I directed, and our 1977 survey, is sufficient to sustain rather elaborate examinations in this area, and I hope that this preliminary report will stimulate my readers to suggest points for further inquiry.

We are able to say that faculty who publish highly attain markedly greater compensation in all age categories. Professors at the leading research universities earn more than their counterparts at institutions of lower scholarly standing, and the gap increases with progression along the academic career. That is, variations in earning between professors at "Tier 1" institutions--the major research universities--and those at "Tier 4" centers--junior colleges and the lesser four year schools--are modest in the under age 35 cohort (Table 9). They get increasingly larger with each succeeding age cohort, and are a very substantial $10,400 among professors in the age 55 and older group. Actual achievement and the opportunities for achievement among the research university faculty contribute to a situation where the gap builds up as the career unfolds. The initial differences reflect, in large part, basic institutional salary, and the beginning salary differentials are relatively modest. Consulting, royalties, research grants, salary levels at the senior ranks, and the like, come in as the career proceeds, and such factors work disproportionately in favor of the research professoriate.

It is important to note that the whole range of opportunities and achievements in the research university setting--and not an inclination to research rather than teaching narrowly construed--accounts for earnings variations by type of school. The differences by researching-teaching orientation actually are modest when one holds constant type of college or university. Thus professors at the research universities who are primarily committed to research receive just about the same total personal earnings as do their teaching-interested colleagues (Table 10).

The matter of the salary of women in the professoriate has been extensively and persuasively examined by others, notably by Alan Bayer and Helen Astin, and by Michael Faia, as it relates to the whole issue of sex discrimination.[5] In separate analyses of the 1972-73 American Council on Education faculty survey, they report that the salary of academic women was $3,500 less than that of men; and that much of this gap resulted from differences in rank, years of employment, field of specialization, involvement in research, and university setting. Controlling for factors which are independently associated with the rate of promotion and salary--field,

---

[5]Alan E. Bayer and Helen S. Astin, "Sex Differentials in the Academic Reward System," Science, (May 23, 1975), pp. 796-802; and Michael A. Faia, "Discrimination and Exchange: The Double Burden of the Female Academic," Pacific Sociological Review, (January 1977), pp. 3-8.

publication record, and institutional status--sharply reduces the salary differentials. Holding this set of variables constant, only 500 dollars a year separated men and women, while sex-related income differentials had been eliminated among those newly hired.

When one looks at total personal professional earnings, however--as opposed to basic institutional salary--the differences separating males and females in the professoriate are very substantial, especially at the research universities (Table 12). These data highlight the importance of an observation made by Astin and Bayer about the complexity of sex discrimination and the need to view it as a broader problem than the specific salary practices of colleges and universities:

> Sex discrimination in academe does not begin when a woman accepts an appointment at a college or university. Rather it is rooted in the cumulative effects of early childhood socialization for "appropriate" sexual behavior and attitudes, differential treatment and expectations of girls and boys by their parents, teachers, and peers throughout adolescence and early adulthood, and differential opportunities for admission to undergraduate and graduate school....As a result, when women enter teaching careers in colleges and universities they have interests, aspirations, expectations, educational backgrounds, and experiences that differ from those of their male counterparts.
>
> As faculty members, women experience a second barrier to equality with men: the academic reward system is biased toward behaviors and activities exhibited more often by men than women. Indeed, the academic reward system was established by men, so rewards go primarily to those women who accept and exhibit men's criteria for academic rewards.[6]

---

[6]Helen S. Astin and Alan E. Bayer, "Sex Discrimination in Academe," in Alice S. Rossi and Ann Calderwood, eds., Academic Women on the Move (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973), p. 333.

Laura Morlock has made a similar observation in noting that women teach a lot more and write a lot less. Curiously, she states--and her findings here coincide with those reported in Table 12--"these differences between time spent in research and teaching are greater in universities than in two-year or four-year colleges. In other words, women are most likely to spend less time in research than their male colleagues in precisely those institutions with the best facilities."[7] The overall professional earnings of women are dramatically lower than men, then, in the research sector of American higher education in large part because women participate less than men in a variety of activities most directly associated with professional compensation.

Table 13 shows that there is no regional difference in professorial earnings among faculty at research universities and the major four-year colleges. Here, a national market operates. On the other hand, at the lesser four-year schools and at the junior colleges, regional variations in earnings are quite substantial. Academics at such schools in the Northeast and in the western states earn considerably more than do their midwestern and southern counterparts. Regional markets, seemingly, are decisive outside of the more prestigious and research-oriented sectors of American higher education.

---

[7]Laura Morlock, "Discipline Variations in the Status of Academic Women," in Rossi and Calderwood, eds., op. cit., p. 283.

Finally, in terms of the data presented in this brief review, we look in Table 14 at variations in earnings by self-professed political ideology. I confess that my purpose here is in part to cast a little information on the lighter side. But there is, as well, a serious objective. The question of discrimination relating to political views has often been raised, sometimes by observers who themselves stand on the Left and on other instances by those on the political Right. Whether there are differences in total professional compensation by political stance is obviously not the only way this large issue of discrimination can be--or should be--approached, but earnings are not an insignificant measure of one's treatment.

Table 14 shows that there simply is no substantial relationship between the stance of academics as they see their political positions--and we find a very high correlation between political self-description and liberal-conservative responses on specific policy choices--and their professional earnings. This is true for the faculty as a whole, for the various age groups, for professors in the different types of colleges and universities, and for faculty in the various disciplinary sectors. The one significant variation shown in Table 14, in which conservatives, especially at the research universities, earn more than their liberal colleagues, proves to be almost entirely an artifact of discipline differences. That is,

professors in the applied professional fields earn more than do their arts and sciences colleagues, and the former fields are significantly more conservative than the latter.

Envoy

The discipline variations in academic professional earnings are striking. The substantial differences in opportunities for gaining compensation outside one's basic institutional salary between faculty in the professional fields and those in many arts and science fields have produced something of a "two class" system in higher education. Professors in the research sector of academe earn substantially more than their colleagues in the teaching areas. These two sets of factors, far more than any others, account for those variations in faculty earnings which exist independent from age and stage of career development.

TABLE 1

Family income, 1974 and 1976, faculty and the general public (column percentages)

	FACULTY		GENERAL PUBLIC			
			All		College Graduates*	
	1976	1974	1976	1974	1976	1974
Under $10,000	2	2	30	36	*	16
$10,000 - $14,999	7	12	20	24	*	17
$15,000 - $19,999	16	21	32	28	*	37
$20,000 - $24,999	24 (40)	22 (43)				
$25,000 - $29,999	15	16				
$30,000 - $39,999	21 (44)	17 (39)	18	10	*	26
$40,000 - $49,999	8	6				
$50,000 and higher	7	4		1	*	4

*Data not yet available from the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 2

Median family income, 1974 and 1976,
faculty and the general public

	1976	1974
Faculty		
All	$25,500	$23,000
Medicine	41,800	40,000
Business	32,300	28,000
Engineering	31,100	25,500
Education	27,700	26,000
Social Sciences	26,900	24,500
Physical Sciences	24,600	22,500
Biological Sciences	24,600	23,000
Humanities	23,400	21,000
Fine Arts	20,900	21,000
General Public		
All	$14,958	$12,836
Professionals	*	19,441
Managers and Administrators	*	19,707
College graduates	20,499	20,124

*Reliable estimates are not currently available.

TABLE 3

Basic institutional salary of faculty for selected years, 1969-1977

	1969	1975	1977
Less than $10,000	35	4	1
$10,000-11,999	21	7	5
$12,000-13,999	16	13	11
$14,000-16,999	14	23	23
$17,000-19,999	8	20	20
$20,000-24,999	5	22	20
$25,000-29,999	2	7	12
$30,000 and over	1	6	9

TABLE 4

Proportions of faculty attaining the specified percentages of supplemental income, 1969-1977

	1969	1975	1977
0%	21	18	17
Less than 10%	31	35	36
10 - 19%	22	23	23
20 - 29%	12	13	11
30 - 39%	5	5	6
40 - 49%	2	2	1
50% and over	6	5	6

TABLE 5

Sources of Supplementary earnings of faculty, 1969 and 1975* (column percentages)

	1969	1975
LARGEST SOURCE		
Summer teaching	26	33
Teaching elsewhere (other than summer)	6	7
Consulting	10	14
Private practice	5	5
Royalties	3	4
Fees for speeches and lectures	3	3
Research salaries and payments	7	7
Other	17	15
None (or none specified)	22	12
SECOND LARGEST SOURCE		
Summer teaching	10	11
Teaching elsewhere (other than summer)	7	14
Consulting	11	14
Private practice	3	4
Royalties	5	7
Fees for speeches and lectures	9	10
Research salaries and payments	4	5
Other	15	14
None (or none specified)	38	22

*This question was not asked in 1977.

TABLE 6

Total personal professional income of faculty, 1976-1977
by basic professional characteristics

	Under $15,000	$15,000-19,999	$20,000-24,999	$25,000-29,999	$30,000-34,999	$35,000-39,999	$40,000-49,999	$50,000 and over
All faculty	15	33	22	14	8	4	3	2
Age								
Under 35	34	45	15	4	1	1	1	0
35-44	12	40	23	13	7	2	2	2
45-54	5	25	25	20	11	6	4	3
55 and older	7	15	22	22	17	9	5	3
Type of school								
Tier 1 (highest)	6	21	17	18	15	10	9	5
Tier 2	9	30	21	14	12	6	5	3
Tier 3	12	33	23	16	9	4	2	1
Tier 4 (lowest)	19	35	22	11	6	3	2	1
Discipline								
Social Sciences	13	36	22	17	6	4	2	1
Humanities	24	33	24	10	4	3	2	1
Fine Arts	24	45	19	6	4	1	1	0
Law	0	7	23	23	27	8	3	9
Physical Sciences	15	32	24	13	9	4	2	0
Biological Sciences	9	43	20	13	9	4	2	0
Medicine	6	9	7	12	10	20	12	24
Education	11	29	22	20	15	3	1	0
Business	3	23	26	17	14	5	10	2
Engineering	12	9	16	24	23	12	5	1
Applied/Professional	19	46	16	8	9	1	0	1
Agriculture	14	11	31	29	9	4	1	2
Kind of appointment								
Tenured	7	29	27	18	10	5	4	2
Untenured	27	44	12	5	6	3	1	2

TABLE 6
(continued)

Total personal professional income of faculty, 1976-1977
by basic professional characteristics

	Under $15,000	$15,000-19,999	$20,000-24,999	$25,000-29,999	$30,000-34,999	$35,000-39,999	$40,000-49,999	$50,000 and over
Research support								
Received support	8	30	21	15	10	8	4	4
No research support	18	34	22	13	8	3	2	1
Consulting								
Done paid consulting	10	28	21	16	12	6	4	3
No paid consulting	19	36	23	12	6	2	2	1
Articles ever published								
None	26	40	23	7	3	1	0	1
1-4	16	39	20	13	6	3	2	0
5-20	7	30	24	18	12	5	4	1
21-50	1	10	21	24	19	11	5	9
More than 50	0	1	9	19	19	22	14	15
Articles published last two years								
None	20	33	21	15	6	2	3	0
1-2	14	36	22	11	10	4	2	1
3-5	7	32	22	15	13	6	3	2
More than 5	3	16	17	18	15	13	7	11

TABLE 7

Median family income of faculty in 1976,
by age and type of school

	Median
AGE:	
Under 35	$19,900
35 - 44	24,000
45 - 54	31,200
55 and older	33,400
TYPE OF SCHOOL:	
Tier 1 (highest)	31,560
Tier 2	28,125
Tier 3	25,270
Tier 4 (lowest)	23,420

TABLE 8

Median total personal professional earnings of faculty, 1976-1977, by scholarly orientations

RESEARCH FUNDING	
Received research grants	$23,100
No research support	19,400
CONSULTING	
Served as paid consultant	23,100
Done no paid consulting	19,400
ARTICLES PAST 2 YEARS	
6 or more	28,900
3 - 5	23,100
1 - 2	19,400
None	19,400

TABLE 9

Median total personal professional earnings, 1976-77, by age, and by scholarly productivity and type of school

	All Faculty	Under 35	35 - 44	45 - 54	55 and older
Number of articles ever published					
None	$17,800	$16,300	$17,800	$21,300	$19,400
1 - 4	19,400	16,300	19,400	23,600	25,600
5 - 20	23,100	19,400	20,900	28,100	25,900
21 - 50	28,900	21,300	28,100	30,600	28,900
More than 50	37,100	23,800	28,900	39,400	37,200
Tier 1 (highest)	27,500	18,500	25,900	31,600	34,100
Tier 2	23,100	17,600	23,100	28,100	28,900
Tier 3	21,300	16,300	20,900	23,600	25,900
Tier 4 (lowest)	19,400	16,300	19,400	23,600	23,700

TABLE 10

Median total personal professional earnings of faculty by teaching-research orientation and selected career characteristics, 1976-1977

	Interested primarily in research	In both, leaning to research	In both, leaning to teaching	Interested primarily in teaching
All faculty	$23,117	$22,508	$19,434	$19,436
By age:				
Under 35	16,286	16,283	16 254	17,815
35-44	23,121	23,264	19,430	19,414
45-54	28,850	28,886	23,620	23,614
55 and older	37,364	28,887	25,864	23,634
By type of school:				
Tier 1 (highest)	25,871	28,119	25,909	25,881
Tier 2	23,128	23,614	22,503	23,116
Tier 3	22,497	22,470	21,265	21,271
Tier 4 (lowest)	22,760	18,507	19,386	19,430
By discipline:				
Social Sciences	23,618	19,432	19,429	21,276
Humanities	19,532	21,275	19,415	16,285
Natural Sciences	22,507	24,971	21,275	19,417
Business/applied	28,864	24,965	21,268	22,491

TABLE 11

Median total personal professional earnings of faculty by rank and discipline, 1976-1977

Rank	Discipline			
	Social Sciences	Humanities	Natural Sciences	Business/ Applied
Instructors	$16,412	$13,141	$14,874	$15,499
Assistant Professors	16,281	15,502	19,362	18,501
Associate Professors	21,291	19,432	19,433	23,615
Professors	28,153	23,679	28,860	28,890

TABLE 12

Median total personal professional earnings
by sex and selected career characteristics, 1976-1977

	Men	Women
All faculty	$21,287	$18,493
By age:		
Under 35	16,287	15,496
35-44	20,921	18,502
45-54	23,634	21,288
55 and older	28,864	19,416
By type of school:		
Tier 1 (highest)	28,127	19,381
Tier 2	23,621	19,377
Tier 3	22,492	17,826
Tier 4 (lowest)	19,434	18,490
By discipline		
Social Sciences	21,276	19,425
Humanities	19,430	16,261
Natural Sciences	21,451	19,364
Business/applied	25,870	18,488

TABLE 13

Median total personal professional earnings of faculty, 1976-1977, by region and kind of institution, controlling for type of school

	All faculty	Tiers I and II	Tiers III and IV
By region:			
Northeast	$22,511	$23,633	$22,491
Midwest	21,268	23,626	19,420
South	18,505	23,122	18,497
West	22,507	23,630	22,496
By kind of school:			
Public	21,271	23,627	19,436
Private	21,267	23,629	19,380

TABLE 14

Median total personal professional earnings
by ideology and selected career characteristics, 1976-1977

	Liberals	Moderates	Conservatives
All faculty	$21,639	$22,360	$22,634
By age:			
Under 35	16,282	17,546	16,277
35-44	19,424	21,267	20,934
45-54	23,634	23,621	25,576
55 and older	27,504	23,124	28,853
By type of school:			
Tier 1 (highest)	25,881	28,109	28,887
Tier 2	22,490	23,604	24,974
Tier 3	19,425	22,505	23,613
Tier 4 (lowest)	19,429	19,418	19,415
By discipline:			
Social Sciences	21,267	23,607	21,305
Humanities	19,417	19,431	17,828
Natural Sciences	21,283	22,477	21,457
Business/applied	23,631	23,614	22,490

APPENDIX A

DATA ON SUPPLEMENTARY EARNINGS OF FACULTY
1976 - 1977

The Economic Position of the American Professoriate:
A Survey Portrait

by

Everett Carll Ladd, Jr.

Presented at the Third Annual Academic Planning Conference
"ETHICAL AND ECONOMIC ISSUES: ACADEMIC SALARIES AND SUPPLEMENTAL INCOME"
January 25, 26, & 27, 1978, Los Angeles, California
University of Southern California Office of Institutional Studies

TABLE 1

Total supplementary income of faculty, by discipline

DISCIPLINE	None	$2,000 or less	$2,001-5,000	$5,001-10,000	$10,001-15,000	$15,001 and over
Social Science	14	45	30	9	2	1
Humanities	25	45	21	5	3	1
Fine Arts	12	48	34	5	1	-
Law	5	28	41	6	17	4
Physical Science	16	28	31	20	5	*
Biological Science	17	41	31	10	2	*
Medicine	26	19	21	8	7	19
Education	18	39	33	10	1	*
Business	7	34	25	18	13	3
Engineering	11	27	29	20	12	2
Applied/ Professional	22	44	25	4	5	*
Agriculture	17	52	20	3	8	-
ALL FACULTY	17	39	28	11	4	2

Median supplementary income: $1,375

Mean supplementary income: $2,250

TABLE 2

Total supplementary income of faculty, by discipline

	None	$2,000 or less	$2,001-5,000	$5,001-10,000	$10,001-15,000	$15,001 and over
DISCIPLINE						
Social Science	14	45	30	9	2	1
Humanities	25	45	21	5	3	1
Natural Science	18	31	30	15	4	3
Business/Applied	14	38	25	12	9	2

TABLE 3

Total supplementary income of faculty, by type of school

	None	$2,000 or less	$2,001-5,000	$5,001-10,000	$10,001-15,000	$15,001 and over
TYPE OF SCHOOL						
Tier 1 (highest)	15	35	25	16	6	4
Tier 2	21	38	26	9	4	2
Tier 3	21	39	24	12	3	1
Tier 4 (lowest)	15	39	31	9	4	2

TABLE 4

Total supplementary income of faculty, by rank

RANK	None	$2,000 or less	$2,001-5,000	$5,001-10,000	$10,001-15,000	$15,001 and over
Instructor	30	42	24	1	3	*
Assistant Professor	23	39	26	8	3	1
Associate Professor	14	41	30	11	3	1
Professor	11	35	29	17	6	3

TABLE 5

Total supplementary income of faculty, by age

AGE	None	$2,000 or less	$2,001-5,000	$5,001-10,000	$10,001-15,000	$15,001 and over
Under 35	22	39	31	8	1	*
35 - 44	16	38	32	10	3	2
45 - 54	13	43	23	14	5	3
55 and older	19	32	29	14	5	2

TABLE 6

Total supplementary income of faculty, by discipline and type of school

DISCIPLINE AND TYPE OF SCHOOL	None	$2,000 or less	$2,001-5,000	$5,001-10,000	$10,001-15,000	$15,001 and over
Social Science						
Tier 1 (highest)	9	34	31	16	7	3
Tier 2	12	34	37	13	4	1
Tier 3	14	41	29	13	3	1
Tier 4 (lowest)	15	52	29	4	-	-
Humanities						
Tier 1 (highest)	17	55	18	10	1	-
Tier 2	30	47	17	5	1	*
Tier 3	25	44	24	6	1	-
Tier 4 (lowest)	25	44	21	4	5	1
Natural Science						
Tier 1 (highest)	19	29	26	18	5	3
Tier 2	23	31	26	10	6	4
Tier 3	27	31	23	16	3	1
Tier 4 (lowest)	10	32	36	15	4	4
Business/Applied						
Tier 1 (highest)	12	28	22	20	9	8
Tier 2	19	38	24	10	5	3
Tier 3	17	37	22	17	6	2
Tier 4 (lowest)	12	40	28	8	12	-

TABLE 7

Total supplementary income of faculty, by discipline and age

Discipline & Age	None	$2,000 or less	$2,001-5,000	$5,001-10,000	$10,001-15,000	$15,001 and over
Social Science						
Under 35	8	50	37	3	2	-
35 - 44	11	40	37	10	1	1
45 - 54	13	45	27	12	2	1
55 and older	16	36	28	15	5	1
Humanities						
Under 35	42	53	3	2	-	-
35 - 44	26	40	29	4	1	-
45 - 54	13	48	24	8	5	3
55 and older	28	32	21	9	10	-
Natural Science						
Under 35	21	27	37	13	2	1
35 - 44	16	33	29	15	5	3
45 - 54	19	34	19	20	4	5
55 and older	17	32	35	10	2	3
Business/Applied						
Under 35	23	35	30	9	3	-
35 - 44	8	42	30	10	9	2
45 - 54	9	41	27	11	10	2
55 and older	16	36	22	20	3	2

TABLE 8

Total supplementary income of faculty at upper quality schools, by discipline

	None	$2,000 or less	$2,001-5,000	$5,001-10,000	$10,001-15,000	$15,001 and over
TIERS I AND II						
Social Science	11	34	34	14	5	2
Humanities	26	49	17	7	1	*
Physical Science	13	29	34	19	4	1
Biological Science	27	38	23	10	2	*
Medicine	25	24	20	10	10	11
Business	2	16	28	20	15	18
Engineering	6	21	35	25	10	3

TABLE 9

Total supplementary income of faculty over age 40 at upper quality schools, by discipline

	None	$2,000 or less	$2,001-5,000	$5,001-10,000	$10,001-15,000	$15,001 and over
OVER AGE 40 AT TIERS I AND II						
Social Science	8	36	27	20	5	4
Humanities	19	50	21	7	1	1
Physical Science	15	27	26	25	5	2
Biological Science	20	37	22	18	3	1
Medicine	23	20	20	11	10	17
Business	4	15	22	22	12	25
Engineering	5	19	36	26	9	5